

REMARKS:

Claims 1-12, 14 and 17-39 were pending in the application prior to the present amendment. Claims 1, 17, and 32 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-12, 14 and 17-39 are pending in the application after entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102 Rejection

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 as being anticipated by Binder (7,200,152). Applicant submits that this rejection is rendered moot in light of the amendment of claim 32.

Section 103 Rejections

Furthermore, Claims 1-12, 14, 17-31 and 33-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 as being unpatentable based on various combinations of Binder (7,200,152), Rossetti et al. (6,420,963), Hosaka et al. (6,448,500), Freeman (5,461,195), Lemke (4,800,236), Lhota (6,399,883), Elms et al. (5,677,974), Batruni et al. (6,215,785), Aslami et al. (5,369,518), Heavy et al. (4,468,571), Pyler et al. (5,145,402), and Belling et al. (3,750,281). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the following reasoning.

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part, “first end *connector*_x wherein a first one of the first end connectors terminates a *first end* of the first section and a second one of the first end connectors terminates a first end of the second section.” This feature is not suggested in any of the cited references. The Examiner argues that Binder teaches this feature at Col. 7, lines 35-47 and Figure 7. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited passage and Figure of Binder describe an embodiment where “the same wires are used for both communication and power.” (See Col. 7, lines 35-36). Thus, one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to use a *plurality* of “end connectors” to “terminate” separate “section[s]” of a “cable”, as claimed. Certainly, Binder never suggests using more than one “end connector” to “terminate” “section[s]” of a “cable” as claimed. Indeed, at Col. 14, line 56 through Col. 15, line 16, Binder discloses using “an Ethernet-based LAN cable” for providing “a power signal and a full-duplex serial digital data signal” to a

“device.” One of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to “terminate” an “Ethernet-based LAN cable” with a *plurality* of “end connectors” as claimed.

In response to these arguments, the Examiner asserts:

In order to clarify the multiple connectors disclosed by Binder, additional sections of Binder have been cited in the rejections above. Binder discloses cables having two dedicated power wire with separate power connectors in addition to wires and corresponding connectors used to carry data (See column 7 lines 20-47, claim 13, and Figure 7 of Binder for reference to the multiple connectors).

Applicant respectfully submits that the claim requires a single cable that carries both data and power, and connectors for terminating the power section and the data section. The cited portions do not teach or suggest such a configuration. Instead, the cited portion teaches a power/data combiner/splitter 71 (shown in Figure 7); however, this does not indicate that the cable that includes power and data sections and has a plurality of terminators that terminate the power section and the data section. Additionally, claim 13 does not appear to relate to the claimed feature. More specifically, claim 13 appears to teach a repeater which repeats data from a first data wire to a second data wire. Applicant submits that a repeater does not relate to a single cable comprising a first section for data and a second section (in parallel to the first) for power, where each section is terminated with a respective connector. Similar arguments apply to claims 17, 23, 32, 33, and 37.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

the first end connectors [are] configured to maintain adequate *physical and electrical contact* with a first node of said network over a range of operationally harsh environmental conditions.

This feature is not suggested in any of the cited references. The Examiner argues that Rossetti teaches this feature at Col. 5, line 43 to Col. 6, line 9 and in Figure 9. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited passage of Rossetti describes a configuration for a “plastic housing” for electronic circuitry. It has nothing to do with “a cable” or “end connectors” of a “cable” as claimed. In addition, the cited passage is concerned with “EMI shielding”, which has nothing to do with “maintain[ing] ... adequate electrical contact” as claimed. Thus, claim 1 and its dependents are patentably distinguished over the cited references at least for the reasons given above. **Applicant notes that the Examiner has not responded to this argument.** Applicant

notes that similar arguments apply to claims 17, 23, 33, and 37 regarding the feature “a weather resistant outer sheath surrounding at least the first and second portions”.

Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that the cited references, taken singly or in combination, fail to teach all the features and limitations of claim 1, and so Applicant submits that claim 1 and those claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art, and are thus allowable. Claims 17, 23, 32, 33, and 37 include similar limitations as claim 1, and so the above arguments apply with equal force to these claims. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that claims 17, 23, 32, 33, and 37, and those claims respectively dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct and non-obvious, and are thus allowable.

Numerous other dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited references. However, given the fact that all independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, it is not believed necessary to address the other dependent claims at this time.

CONCLUSION:

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

Applicant has petitioned herewith for what is believed to be the appropriate extension of time. If any further extensions are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-03700/JCH.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2008-08-27

By: /Jeffrey C. Hood/
Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8820